

MINUTES OF THE VINEYARD
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
240 East Gammon Road, Vineyard, Utah
May 23, 2018 at 6:00 PM

Present

Mayor Julie Fullmer
Councilmember John Earnest
Councilmember Tyce Flake
Councilmember Chris Judd
Councilmember Nate Riley

Absent

Staff Present: City Manager/Finance Director Jacob McHargue, Public Works Director/Engineer Don Overson, Sergeant Holden Rockwell with the Utah County Sheriff's Department, Water/Parks Manager Sullivan Love, City Attorney David Church, Building Official George Reid, City Planner Elizabeth Hart, Planning Commission Chair Cristy Welsh, Finance Intern Karuva Kaseke

Others Present: Residents Jack Holdaway, Nicole Wood, Anthony Jenkins, and Stan Jenne Stewart Park with Anderson Geneva

6:00 PM **REGULAR SESSION**

Mayor Fullmer opened the meeting at 6:00 PM. Councilmember Earnest gave the invocation.

OPEN SESSION – Citizens' Comments

Resident Jack Holdaway living on Holdaway Road stated that he was requesting reimbursement for the road base that had been installed for a trail that was required in his subdivision. He said that he had since learned that the trail had not been approved by council and wanted the land put back to its original state. He stated that he had the road base removed because he did not want it there. Mr. McHargue said that staff had met and it was their opinion that the trail should be installed as part of the City's trail system. He explained that they were looking into the cost to complete that section of trail now. He said that staff felt they were warranted in requiring the road base to be put down and that it should remain there until they were ready to install the trail. He added that staff felt that there should be no reimbursement. Mr. Holdaway said that he had spoken with the City's legal counsel who said that it was not approved and that he should not be charged for the trail system. He explained that the reason he did not want the trail there was because the incomplete trail across the street was not being maintained. He pointed out that the other development had not been required to pay for their trail. Mr. Church explained that in each development, the city had to justify the amount of trail required, based on the size of the development. He said that the development had to install the public facilities which were made necessary by the development. He stated that when he discussed this issue with city staff, he agreed that the dedication of the land was fair but that they should not require the full improvements on the trail. He said that they could require a trail but had to balance the size of

the development with the trail needs and the benefits given to the city. He added that it did not make sense to require the completion of the trail when it would not be connecting to anything. Councilmember Judd asked about the maintenance of the other trail. Mr. McHargue replied that this was one reason they were looking at paving the trail now to make it easier to maintain.

Mayor Fullmer asked where the city stood now that the road base had been removed. She also asked about the fire hydrant that Mr. Holdaway had moved. Mr. Overson replied that the city would have to put the road base back down, which would be an added expense. He explained that the fire hydrant had been placed according to the City's standards for Holdaway Road and had to be moved when it was decided to install a trail there. He felt that it was part of the development process to move the fire hydrant. He explained that Mr. Holdaway was only having to dedicate a small section of the trail because the city already owned the rest of the right-of-way. Mayor Fullmer asked what the metric was to determine the amount of trail required. Mr. Church replied that it was normally negotiated at the time of the development before it was even platted. He said that he had not heard any complaints until after the plat had been recorded and did not know what brought up the issue now. He pointed out that they had done the evaluation in arrears. Mr. McHargue explained that the city was initially requiring the whole trail to be completed. Mr. Holdaway clarified that when he first received the bid from Don Sterling Excavation (SDX) they had not included the trail system and then the city told SDX they had to include it. Mr. Church asked what the bid amount was for the trail. Mr. Holdaway replied that it was almost \$6,000. Mr. Church said that the question was, in addition to the road base, was it fair to require him to pay the \$6,000 for a five-lot subdivision.

Councilmember Riley explained what happened to the Shoreline trail when it was installed too soon and the city had to repair it later. He asked why the city was requiring a section of trail to be put in now when it would not be connected to anything for a few years. Mr. Overson replied that he also questioned why they were requiring a trail now when it had no beginning or end. Councilmember Judd explained that when he sat through the discussions on the Parkside Place subdivision, they had required the trail. Mr. Overson explained that they had only required the road base to be installed for that subdivision. He said that it was easier to maintain the road base and that we would look at taking care of it. He felt that they should not install the asphalt at this time. He explained what would need to be done to the road base once the city was ready to install the trail. The discussion about the trail continued.

Mayor Fullmer asked if the city would be able to maintain the trail area. Mr. Overson replied that the Public Works Department would take care of it.

Mr. Holdaway stated that it was not a straight line and that the road base would be a mess. Mr. Overson explained that the city owned 10 feet from the back of the curb and they did not want people to landscape or develop into their easement. There was a discussion about the right-of-way. Councilmember Judd expressed concern that Mr. Holdaway needed to let the new landowners know that there was an easement there. Mr. McHargue asked if they could use a smaller caliber road base. Mr. Overson explained that the road base had not been compacted and if it had been it would be as hard as concrete.

Mr. Holdaway replied that he would specify to those purchasing the lots that they could not install anything except grass. Mayor Fullmer verified that the road base had been removed. She recapped that they would not be completing the trail and were still debating if they were going to install the road base and make the right-of-way a straight line. She felt that staff should meet with Mr. Holdaway to discuss how this was going to work. Mr. Holdaway mentioned that there would be a three to four-inch step off of the trail in that area. Mr. Overson explained that they could install more road base and bring it up to grade. There was further discussion about the trail.

Mayor Fullmer asked if they could have a meeting to come up with a solution. Councilmember Judd asked if Mr. Holdaway had been reimbursed by SDX after they had removed the road base. Mr. Holdaway replied that he had not. Councilmember Judd expressed his concern that Mr. Holdaway had caused an additional cost for the city. He explained that in addition to a reimbursement for the installation of the road base the city would have to pay to have it reinstalled. He said that from the time that council had stated that they would discuss it further and get back to him he went ahead and had the road base removed. Mr. Holdaway explained that he had a time frame to follow and had to make a decision. He said that he was still of the opinion that he would rather have sod until the trail was ready to go in.

Mr. McHargue agreed to hold a meeting with Mr. Holdaway to discuss the issue further.

Mr. Church stated that if there were no sprinklers then there would be nothing wrong with having sod. He said that the problem would be if the homeowner were to install sprinklers, a fence, trees, etc. on the right-of-way, then it would be more expensive. Councilmember Earnest asked if there would be an additional cost to the city. There would be costs either way to prepare the site and install the trail. Councilmember Judd asked how the city would ensure that the landowners did not build on the right-of-way. Mayor Fullmer asked if they were not going to reimburse Mr. Holdaway at this time. Mr. Holdaway felt that he should be reimbursed for the road base. Mr. Church explained that this was not unlike a park strip where by law the city allowed them to put in sod, sprinklers, and trees. He said that when the city needed to tear it up for any number of reasons they did not have to reimburse the homeowner. Councilmember Judd commented that there was already a trail on the plat and that Holdaway Road had always been treated differently. Mr. Church explained that the standard for Holdaway Road was not for a full sidewalk but for a public walkway, which was less than a sidewalk but more than nothing. He said that was why it was fair to have the landowner put it in.

Mayor Fullmer asked the staff if there was anything they wished to share and for their recommendation. Mr. McHargue replied that his recommendation was that the city not reimburse Mr. Holdaway but allow him to put grass until they were ready to install the trail.

Mr. Holdaway asked if the council could take a vote or if he could get an opinion from the councilmembers.

Councilmember Riley said that he wanted to read through the minutes from the last meeting before he made a decision. He expressed concern that Mr. Holdaway had moved forward without waiting for input from the city and was now requesting reimbursement. He felt that Mr. Holdaway had acted on his own behalf without waiting for any further input. Mr. Holdaway stated that he had expected an answer at the last meeting. He said that he had been under a time constraint and needed to take care of it.

Mayor Fullmer felt that they should set up a meeting to review everything.

Councilmember Judd stated that he had a hard time with reimbursing Mr. Holdaway after the council had received the information from the last meeting and were going to discuss it further and then in the meantime, Mr. Holdaway had incurred additional expenses. Councilmember Earnest agreed with no reimbursement but liked the grass idea. Councilmember Flake agreed that they should have a meeting with staff and Mr. Holdaway, where they could come to a resolution by the end of the coming week. Mr. McHargue stated that he would set up a meeting with Mr. Holdaway for this week. Mayor Fullmer felt that they should have grass in that area if the city was not going to install the trail right away and it would look nicer for the sale of the lots. She

said that they needed to review the information before they made a final decision on whether or not to reimburse Mr. Holdaway.

Resident Nicole Wood living in The Cottonwoods subdivision explained that she wanted to rent out her basement and had followed all of the guidelines for an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). She said that she was waiting to finish her basement because she had been told that the city was working towards a more reasonable procedure for an ADU. Ms. Hart explained that they were updating the ordinance by removing the requirement of a business license. She said that they were updating the process so that the property was approved for the use, not the property owner. She mentioned that the ordinance was scheduled for approval in June. Ms. Wood said that she would be willing to wait for the approval to finish her basement.

Ms. Wood asked why the Center Street overpass would only be one lane each way. Mr. Overson replied that the main reason was that, in the last transportation study, more traffic was modeled going north than east. This made it so that the city was not required to have four lanes. He added that the cost to add the two extra lanes would be an additional \$4 to \$5 million. Mayor Fullmer stated that the space to add the additional two lanes was not there anymore. Ms. Wood explained that she works off of Geneva Road and 500 South and that it was becoming more difficult to turn left onto 400 South just before Geneva Road, so she was taking a route through the neighborhood. She felt that a lot of people would be using Center Street. She mentioned that there was a freeway entrance off of Center Street. Mayor Fullmer explained that the plans for the overpass and development were done 11 years ago and the infrastructure was now in place. She added that the city was now one of the fastest growing cities in the nation. Mr. Overson said that when they were doing the study they took the model to what they thought would be build out. He commented that the Waters Edge development had fewer lots than originally projected and that the Homestead development had stayed the same. He said that there would be a signalized intersection so traffic would move quickly. He mentioned that there would be peak times in the mornings and evenings but the lights could be synchronized to move traffic. Mayor Fullmer said that, as the city noticed the failures at the signal lights, they had been working with UDOT to correct those failures. Ms. Wood asked if they were saving any space for potential growth. Mayor Fullmer mentioned that at this point the land to expand the overpass was gone was gone and that getting the air rights was difficult. She felt that the transportation study was matching growth. Ms. Wood said that having a dedicated green turn light on to Geneva Road from 400 South had helped. Mr. Overson added that in the future UDOT would be opening a second left turn lane onto Geneva Road for when the queue reaches Vineyard Road.

Mayor Fullmer called for further comments. Hearing none, she closed the public session.

MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS' REPORTS/DISCLOSURES/RECUSALS

Councilmember Judd reported that he had attended the Utah Valley Visioning Summit on Monday. He said that it was attended by municipalities, school districts, and the Chambers of Commerce throughout the valley. He said that they had talked about education, workforce recruitment, development, and housing affordability. He added that they had also talked about transportation with MAG, UDOT, and UTA. He mentioned that there would be a meeting to discuss the 2050 Transportation Plan. He added that by 2060 Utah County's population would surpass Salt Lake County's.

Mayor Fullmer explained how the Visioning Summit worked and how they hoped to get the state's representatives to see where Utah Valley was going because of its exponential growth.

She reported that she had met with UDOT and UTA to move forward on the FrontRunner Station. She reported that they were still in discussions with Union Pacific Railroad about removing the tracks on the east side by the Vineyard Connector and behind the Megaplex, etc. She mentioned that the city would be meeting with the school board.

Councilmember Flake reported that there would be a meeting with the Utah Lake Commission in June about cleaning up some of the property. He said that the transportation meeting would be on June 29. Mayor Fullmer mentioned that she had gotten tickets for people to attend.

Mayor Fullmer reminded everyone that Vineyard had been participating in Bike Month and that they had one more event on May 31 at Gammon Park.

STAFF AND COMMISSION REPORTS

City Manager/Finance Director – Jacob McHargue – Mr. McHargue reported that staff had attended several meetings this week. He mentioned that Mr. Brim was attending a retail conference in Las Vegas. Mayor Fullmer explained that the city had met with Economic Development Corporation of Utah (EDC Utah) who was putting a demographic project together. She said that anyone who wanted a grocery store, restaurants, etc., to come into Vineyard should attend the Food Truck Rally at The Forge development to show residential support. She said that brokers would be attending and watching the metrics to see if it would be worth it to bring stores, restaurants, etc., into our community.

Mr. McHargue reported that he had attended the Parade of Homes planning session. He mentioned that Leisure Villas would have a home in the Parade of Homes this year, which would bring 20,000 people to the city. Councilmember Judd mentioned that Utah Valley Home Builders Association (UVHBA) was building a new office in Vineyard.

Mr. McHargue reported that there was a meeting with UTA and UDOT about the FrontRunner station for the first week in June and that they were inviting the landowners to attend. He reported that Governor Herbert would be visiting the city next week. He said that the Summer Celebration would be held on June 30 in conjunction with the grand opening of the 18-acre park. He asked everyone to please stay out of the park until it was finished. He explained that every time someone accessed the park the developer had to repair it before he could continue work on it.

Public Works Director/Engineer – Don Overson – Mr. Overson reported that yesterday was moving day for the Public Works Department to the basement of the city offices. He said that he was still working on the Center Street overpass. He said they were putting together a site plan for the new Public Works yard on the property that the city was purchasing in Lindon. He added that he had a discussion with the Lindon Boat Harbor about being put on the Vineyard sewer and water system.

City Attorney – David Church – Mr. Church had no new items to report.

Utah County Sheriff's Department – Sergeant Holden Rockwell – Sergeant Rockwell reported that Deputy Chad Stilson would be holding a graduation for the NOVA class on May 30 at Vineyard Elementary. He also reported that they held a bike rodeo last Saturday as part of Bike Month. He reported that Deputy Stilson had received an award at the Sheriff's Department Awards Banquet for his outstanding work in Vineyard.

Community Development Director – Morgan Brim & Planning Commission Chair – Cristy Welsh – Chair Welsh reported that O'Reilly Auto Parts' site plan had been submitted. She said that they had also been working with UVHBA on their building. She said that they had been getting pushback on the city's sign codes. Ms. Hart reported that they were updating the sign ordinance and UVHBA had given their comments on it. She added that they were also working on Home Occupation, ADU, and Hearing Officer ordinance updates.

City Recorder – Pamela Spencer – Ms. Spencer had no new items to report.

Building Official – George Reid – Mr. Reid reported that the Building Department held a successful third annual contractor appreciation luncheon yesterday. He reported that the Public Works and Engineering Department had moved to the basement offices. He said that staff was waiting for the installation of the recording system to complete the new Council Chambers. Ms. Spencer remarked that she was waiting to hear from JCG Technologies about the equipment.

Water/Parks Manager Sullivan Love – Mr. Love reported that the candidate who was offered the position of Timpanogos Special Service District (TSSD) Manager had turned them down. He mentioned that the Provo Harbor had reopened. He reported that the Utah Lake Commission's annual lake festival plans were underway for June 2. He encouraged everyone to participate. He reported that the tree removal plan had to be postponed until fall because the trees had leafed out too soon. He added that the contractor would honor the same bid amount. He explained that the arborist was a separate contractor.

Mayor Fullmer asked Mr. Overson what the process was to change the name on a street. Mr. Overson explained the process. He mentioned that starting in July the city would have a new ZIP Code, 84059. Mayor Fullmer mentioned that the new ZIP Code could be used now. There was further discussion about the process to change the name on a street.

CONSENT ITEMS

- a) Approval of the May 9, 2018 City Council Meeting Minutes
- b) Approval of Final Plat Edgewater Phase 13

Mayor Fullmer called for a motion. Councilmember Judd asked Councilmember Riley if he wished to have the minutes pulled from the consent for further review. Councilmember Riley agreed.

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER JUDD MOVED TO REMOVE CONSENT ITEM A AND ACCEPT APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM B. COUNCILMEMBER FLAKE SECONDED THE MOTION. MAYOR FULLMER, COUNCILMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND RILEY VOTED AYE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MAYOR'S APPOINTMENTS

No items were submitted.

BUSINESS ITEMS

7.1 PUBLIC HEARING – Adopted Tentative Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Budget

The mayor and City Council will hear public comment concerning the adopted Tentative Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Budget. Utah State Code 10-6-115 states that after the conclusion of the public hearing, the mayor and City Council may continue to review the tentative budget.

Mayor Fullmer called for a motion to go into a public hearing.

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER JUDD MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:00 PM. COUNCILMEMBER FLAKE SECONDED THE MOTION. MAYOR FULLMER, COUNCILMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND RILEY VOTED AYE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mayor Fullmer turned the time over to City Manager/Finance Director Jacob McHargue.

Mr. McHargue presented the budget. Highlights were:

2018 Retreat Goals

- Projects
 - Overpass
 - FrontRunner Station
 - Town Center
 - General Plan
 - Focus
 - Code Enforcement
 - Parks & Recreation
 - Sustainable Enterprise Funds

Mr. McHargue explained that the council and staff met in January to discuss goals and upcoming projects. He said that most of the goals that were set were centered around the projects.

Mr. McHargue said that the Census Bureau released to the media the updated census information. Vineyard had a population estimate of 6,210 people which is much less than the actual population numbers. He explained that the Census Bureau used different data and were a year behind. Mayor Fullmer mentioned that the Census Bureau had requested that an update from the city be sent to them. Mr. McHargue stated that the 2020 census would show a major increase. He said that the city had 57 percent growth, making Vineyard the city with the highest level of growth in the state three years in a row.

General Fund Overview

- Budgeting for \$5,5372,00
 - Increase from FY 18 \$334,540 (6%)

FY 2019 General Fund Revenues

▪ Property Tax	36%
▪ Total License and Permits	18%
▪ Total Miscellaneous Revenue	21%
▪ Sale Tax	14%
▪ Franchise Tax	6%
▪ Total Intergovernmental Revenue	5%

Councilmember Judd asked if the change in ZIP Code would help with franchise tax. Mr. McHargue replied that it was split by city boundaries.

General Fund Expenditures

▪ Public Safety	31%
▪ Building Inspections	16%
▪ Administration	15%
▪ Transfers	11%
▪ Public Works	10%
▪ Parks	9%
▪ Sanitation	4%
▪ Contracted Services	3%
▪ Buildings and Grounds	2%

Mr. McHargue explained that contracted services used to make up a large portion of the budget. He said that as the city continued to grow they were able to bring more services in-house. He stated that this saved the city money and provided better services. He noted that they would be hiring new positions this year.

New Positions

- FT Building Inspector in Training
- FT Planning Tech / Code Enforcement Coordinator
- FT Water Operator
- (2) PT Parks Laborers
- PT Recreation Coordinator
- Referees

Water Fund

▪ Water Revenues	\$2,676,400
▪ Proposed fee change to Tiered Rate System	
▪ Water Expenses	\$2,842,900
▪ Projected Subsidy	\$166,500

There was a discussion about the purchase of water.

Water Fund Tiered Rate

▪ Current Fee Schedule	
▪ Water Usage Rate	\$1.35 per 1,000 gallons
▪ Proposed Fee Schedule (state code 73-10-32.5)	
▪ Tier 1 Residential	\$1.50 per 1,000 gallons 0-30,000
▪ Tier 2 Residential	\$3.00 per 1,000 gallons 30,001+
▪ Tier 1 Commercial	\$1.50 per 1,000 gallons 0-30,000

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tier 2 Commercial ▪ Tier 3 Commercial | <p>\$1.75 per 1,000 gallons
from 30,001-100,000</p> <p>\$3.00 per 1,000 gallons
100,001+</p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Mr. McHargue explained that the Utah State Code required cities to use a tier system. He explained how he came up with the amounts for the tiers. There was a discussion about how they could set up the tiered system. Mr. McHargue mentioned that he had looked at all of the residential and commercial usages.

Ms. Wood asked why the flat rate was currently \$1.35 and would be going up. Mr. McHargue replied it was only going up \$.15. He explained that the General Fund had historically subsidized the Water Fund rather than have the Water Fund pay its way. Councilmember Judd further explained that the city had been paying for the additional use of the water and the state wanted the Water Fund to work under its own revenues. He said that the increase was due to the actual water use by residents. Councilmember Riley stated that the city wanted to, over a period of time, increase the water rates in increments. Mr. McHargue mentioned that this was the last year for the increment.

Resident Anthony Jenkins asked why there were only two tiers for the residential use. Mr. McHargue replied that staff did not want a punitive charge for residents to use the water inside their home. He said that they looked at summer usage. He explained the rate they chose was with the assumption that 80% of residents were conserving water and with that assumption then 30,000 gallons was the maximum cutoff number. He said that most people use 3,000 to 6,000 gallons of water inside their home in the summer.

Mayor Fullmer mentioned that the city had partnered with an organization to help teach water conservancy. Mr. McHargue stated that Mr. Love had been a good resource for residents as well.

Councilmember Judd said that as the state was seeing the water availability decrease with the increase of residents, they could see water conservancy mandated on a state level. Mr. McHargue explained that the reason they were increasing the rates was that the water system had a life expectancy and the city needed to build up a fund balance to help replace the system. Cities were running into problems because they did not plan for replacement of the system. He said that if they build the fund balance now, then they would not have to charge the residents a significant dollar amount later. There was a discussion about the water system expenses.

Ms. Wood asked about the flat rate system. Mr. McHargue explained that there was a minimum base rate, which would not be changing. He said that the flat base rate going forward would be \$21.67 plus a \$1.50 per 1,000 gallons used. For example, if you used 4,000 gallons you would pay an additional \$6. He said that part of the base rate went into the calculation of what funds were needed to fund the balance. Mr. McHargue explained that they were only proposing a \$.15 rate change.

Ms. Wood asked how Vineyard's costs compared to other cities. Mr. McHargue replied that the city did not own any water so they had to purchase it from Orem and CUWCD which made the rates a little higher. Mayor Fullmer noted that Tier 2 was lower than other cities. Mr. Church stated that this would always be the most expensive water in the valley if they were to charge to true costs because as a new city there were no benefits from any pioneer water rights. He added that the property tax had been subsidizing the water fund from the beginning. He said that eventually the water rates would even out with other cities because their new water growth would be expensive water. There was continued discussion about the water purchase and rights.

Councilmember Judd said that residents moving from out of state were amazed at the lower water costs. He was of the opinion that costs would not get any better and they needed to look at ways to conserve water. Mr. Church mentioned that the state wanted to bring the water costs up to the true value of the water, so they were putting pressure on cities to go to a tiered system to make the “water wasters” pay the actual costs of their water. Mr. Love explained that the Central Utah Project had purchased all of the water rights used by the steel mill on the Geneva Property.

Mr. McHargue commented that he had attended the Lindon City Council meeting when they discussed transferring money from the Enterprise Funds to offset costs in the General Fund.

Ms. Wood suggested that they have more tiers in the future to incentivize conservation. Mr. McHargue explained that this year residents would get 5,000 gallons with the base rate and then 4,000 gallons next year. There was a discussion about the tiered plan for the water services. Resident Stan Jenne asked Mr. McHargue to explain the difference between the residential and commercial tiers. Mr. McHargue explained that they had used the 80% rule for commercial; the same as for residential. He explained that 80% of commercial users were using less than 100,000 gallons of water. Mr. Jenne asked why commercial users would be paying less than residential users after the 30,000 gallons. Mr. McHargue explained that they looked at the use from summer and winter and it was similar to the residential, which was below the 30,000 gallons. He said that he wanted to keep them on the same threshold as the residential. He did not want to de-incentivize businesses to come to the city. Councilmember Judd commented that they needed to decide what they wanted to require businesses to use for landscaping. Mr. McHargue stated that the goal was to promote conservation.

Sewer Fund

▪ Sewer Revenues	\$654,600
▪ Proposed fee change from \$3.00 to \$3.25 per 1,000 gallons	
▪ Sewer Expenses	\$596,600
▪ Salaries & Benefits	\$23,200
▪ Equipment	\$45,000

Mr. McHargue explained that the city did not meter sewer usage, so they take an average of water usage from November to March and charge that amount for sewer usage the following year. He said that most of the residents were using 4,000 to 6,000 gallons a month in the winter. He stated that a larger portion of the charges were direct passthrough fees to TSSD and the balance was for replacement reserves.

Storm Water Fund

▪ Storm Water Revenues	\$140,000
▪ Proposed Fee Changes	
▪ Monthly Storm Water Fee \$4.00 to \$5.00 per ERU	
▪ Land Disturbance Permit Fee \$0 to \$510 (5 Acre Commercial)	

Mr. McHargue explained that the city was not currently charging a fee but they needed to charge a fee to recoup the inspection costs.

▪ Storm Water Expenses	\$131,900
▪ Equipment	\$25,500

Transportation Fund

▪ Transportation Revenues	\$361,900
▪ B&C Road Funds from General Fund	\$325,000
▪ Transportation Expenses	\$352,000

▪ Mill Road Project	\$270,000
▪ HA5 Treatment	\$75,000

Capital Projects

▪ Trail Projects	\$60,000
▪ Road Striping	\$92,000
▪ Quivira Street Extension	\$360,000
▪ Wetland Delineation	\$50,000
▪ 2000 North Improvements	\$183,000
▪ Contribution from General Fund	\$108,000
▪ Appropriation from Fund Balance	\$637,000

Mr. McHargue explained what “Fund Balance” was, which was not money from the Enterprise Funds.

Councilmember Riley asked if there had been any conversations about 400 South completion obligations from the city. Mr. Overson explained that the city had completed the design process and the Clegg family did not want to discuss giving the city any right-of-way. He felt that the city should soon be able to widen 400 South because of the potential development of the Clegg property.

Mayor Fullmer asked if the striping changes were still in place from 400 South to the Lakeview Drive Corner. Mr. Overson replied that they had money in place to improve the sight distance off of 600 East and to stripe into Sleepy Ridge. Councilmember Riley said he was asking about not just the expansion, but the widening of the road at the intersection of 400 South and Holdaway Road. Mr. Overson stated that they had not looked at it since the council had decided not to move forward with the 400 South Project. He said that they could look at making the intersection better. Mayor Fullmer asked if they had discussed widening the road and installing a roundabout. Mr. Overson replied that they had looked at installing a full cross intersection, which would go into The Elms subdivision when the funds were pulled from the project to be used on the Center Street overpass. Mr. McHargue felt it would be much easier to develop that project when the Clegg property was owned by a developer.

RDA Revenues

▪ Property Taxes Increment	\$8,097,000
▪ RDA Administration Increment	\$337,400

RDA Expenses

▪ Bond Principal Payments	\$2,951,000
▪ Bond Interest Payments	\$1,579,700
▪ Capital Projects	\$21,400,000
▪ Remediation Westside	\$7,000,000
▪ Remediation Eastside	\$7,000,000
▪ Center Street Overpass	\$5,000,000
▪ Main Street Design	\$200,000
▪ Water Storage Design	\$200,000
▪ Ground Purchase	\$2,000,000

Councilmember Judd explained that the RDA was a separate entity and the funds were not comingled.

Ms. Wood asked about remediation. Mr. McHargue explained the RDA and that remediation was cleanup. He said that the landowner had a portion of the cleanup and the RDA had a portion, along with US Steel. He said that the RDA was basically from Center Street North. Councilmember Riley asked about the mitigation payment to the school district. Mr. McHargue replied that it did not look like the city would have to make an Alpine School District mitigation payment. He explained how the contract worked.

Mayor Fullmer called for additional public comments. Hearing none, she called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER JUDD MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:40 PM. COUNCILMEMBER FLAKE SECONDED THE MOTION. MAYOR FULLMER, COUNCILMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND RILEY VOTED AYE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mayor Fullmer called for further comments. Mr. Church commented, for the minutes, that this budget did not anticipate a property tax increase.

7.2 DISCUSSION AND ACTION – Consultant Fees for Facilitation of a Workshop and Concept Plan for Vineyard FrontRunner Station and adjacent Town Center property

Consideration of consultant services for facilitation of a design workshop and the creation of a concept plan of the future Vineyard FrontRunner Station and adjacent Town Center property. The mayor and City Council will take appropriate action.

Mayor Fullmer turned the time over to City Planner Elizabeth Hart.

Ms. Hart stated that staff was recommending that the city hire a design consultant to help put together a conceptual plan for the FrontRunner station so the city could give it to UDOT to make sure the City's vision, ideas, and comments were implemented into the final design.

Mayor Fullmer explained that this was different from the Request for Proposal (RFP) that UDOT, UTA, and the design process team would be sending out. This idea was to hire someone who would take the City's designs to that group and then implement that process. Ms. Hart agreed. She said that they had sent out an RFP and received three bids and staff was recommending Saltus Architecture + Urban Design because they had the qualifications required and were the lowest bidder of the three. She disclosed that Jeff Knighton the co-founder of Saltus was a current Planning Commissioner.

Mayor Fullmer asked if hiring Mr. Knighton's firm would work with the City's ordinances. Mr. Church replied that it worked with the state law if there was full disclosure and they accept it. He stated that Planning Commissioners were volunteers for the city. He said that it would need to be publicly disclosed. Mr. McHargue commented that the Planning Commission had not been involved in the bidding process. Mayor Fullmer asked if the design process would be going through the Planning Commission. Councilmember Judd replied that Mr. Knighton would need to recuse himself from those discussions. Mr. Church said that it needed to be fully discussed in the public meeting before council made a decision.

Councilmember Judd asked why staff was recommending Saltus. Ms. Hart replied that the biggest thing she noticed was that Saltus could provide a 3D visual and she felt that it was important to give a better visual. Councilmember Judd asked if Saltus had done a design of a FrontRunner Station or something similar. Ms. Hart said that they had stated that they had done something similar.

Mayor Fullmer asked what the process was to review the proposals. Mr. McHargue replied that Mr. Brim had come up with the process. Ms. Hart did not believe that there were any interviews done, just bid sheets.

Mayor Fullmer asked if it was necessary to hire a consultant do something that was being done by UDOT, UTA, and staff members. Councilmember Flake stated that he had discussed it with staff and his concern was that UDOT and UTA only build concrete platforms, which he felt was not a train station. He said that he questioned if the city would have a lot of input unless the city had something to put in front of them. Mr. McHargue said that the goal was to get the council involved in the design process. Mayor Fullmer asked if the landowners would be involved in the design process. Mr. McHargue replied that the council could involve whomever they wanted to.

Councilmember Judd asked why the design firms were not doing a presentation to the council. Mr. McHargue replied that they would be doing that for the General Plan, but this was just a small project.

Mayor Fullmer expressed concern that the city would be paying twice for the same exact project. Councilmember Judd asked who the other design team would be representing. Mayor Fullmer stated that they would be representing whomever the city invited to be a part of it: anyone from the council, city staff, landowners, and UVU. She said that they had come up with a group of individuals to find a designer to build out the scope. She said that she could see the benefit but should the city pay for it twice? Councilmember Judd asked what the cost was. Ms. Hart replied that it was \$4,500. Mr. Overson stated that they had \$4 million to put towards a train station. His concern was that UDOT had never built a train station before and would be in charge of the project and was asking for some direction. He wanted them to look at all of the phases and what they wanted to spend the money on. Mr. McHargue said that there was no reason that they could not have the design team be a part of the discussions. This would put the city a step ahead and make the project go faster by hiring a design group. Councilmember Judd said that they may feel they were ahead, but who was to say that the other entities were not doing the same thing. He felt comfortable with hiring a designer. Mr. McHargue said that it was clear that Vineyard was the only group pushing the FrontRunner Station. Mayor Fullmer said that Vineyard was going to keep driving the process forward because they wanted the build-out to happen this year. Mr. McHargue felt that hiring a design team was a step in the right direction. Mayor Fullmer asked what Saltus said the project timeline was. She explained that the core group would be meeting in two weeks and then sending out their RFP. She added that they would be working with a team that had built these stations before. Ms. Hart replied that two of the bidders gave a six-week timeline and Saltus did not include it.

Councilmember Judd asked who would be choosing the RFP at the core group level. Mr. McHargue replied that UDOT would be. Mayor Fullmer stated that it would be the whole core group. She said that the project manager had stated that they would not move forward unless the group agreed. Councilmember Judd understood that UDOT would get to choose the RFP. Mr. Overson stated that UDOT had to follow the process. There was a discussion about the process. Mr. Overson explained that the RFP would have a list of steps to design and build the train station. He said that the city wanted to make sure they had enough steps to cover all their bases. Mr. McHargue mentioned that UTA had never done a station either. He felt that there would be multiple RFPs. Mayor Fullmer felt that they did not know the scope of what it was going to take. She said that she did not mind using one of these companies but was concerned about them meeting the core group's timelines and about the potential for doubling meetings and funding. She asked if this was really pivotal and what were the exact points as to why they needed to do it. Mr. Overson asked if they were to accept the bid could they have them go to the group with their points of concern. He said if the timeline did not fit, then it would not help them. Mayor

Fullmer said that she was all for having their vision before they get somewhere but did not know if it was useful for the City's funding. Councilmember Judd felt that the funding was small compared to what they would be getting the scope of. He said if they went to the meeting without having a vision above and beyond UTA's then they would be playing catchup.

Councilmember Riley expressed concern that this company did not have the expertise to walk them through the process. He felt that someone had to have enough expertise to ask the critical questions and walk them through it. He said the third group's bid was twice as much but had the expertise. Councilmember Judd said that he did not see the scope that Saltus had done this before and that was why he wanted to know if they were going to do a presentation. He said that if the one group was double the cost but could get it through because of the time crunch, they would be paying for expertise and for a rush. Ms. Hart said that in their bid Saltus stated that they would participate in a charrette-type work session with the city and share some precedent projects and similar concepts that they had developed for other communities. Mayor Fullmer said that the core group would be doing an RFP scope and would meet with the individual groups to determine the scope they wanted to do with the funds they had. Mr. McHargue felt that they were not in a time crunch and that it would be the city who would keep the project moving forward. He suggested that they could take a couple of weeks to answer the questions, evaluate the three firms, and have them do a presentation. Mayor Fullmer stated that it had been hard to get the core group in the same room and now that they had everyone's schedule, they were about to go into the RFP scope, and it would be the city pushing the timeline. She asked that if they hired this firm to do this design, would they be the same people they would be going after with the core group's RFP. She reviewed the timeline and asked if they could have everything ready. There was further discussion about meeting the timelines. Councilmember Judd felt that he wanted to be prepared, when they go into the meetings with the core group, with a vision of what the city wanted to see. Mayor Fullmer feared that they would not meet the timelines, and that they would be doing the exact same thing and doubling up the meetings. She said that there had been discussions at these meetings, except for what Vineyard wanted to see. She said that her concept was that they wanted something unique for Vineyard. She again expressed her concern about timelines, spending extra money, and being involved with too heavy of a review process.

Councilmember Riley said that it seemed that they had enough time to have staff answer the critical question of whether or not we would be doubling our efforts. He said if the answer was no, then they would be looking at how to best look at the vision Vineyard would like to create. Mr. McHargue felt that this would give a collective vision from the city as a whole to give to the group or the architects.

Councilmember Judd asked if there had been any discussions about if they would be doubling their efforts. Mr. McHargue felt that they would not be doubling their efforts and would have a different vision than the other groups. He felt it would be a helpful process to go through in preparing the city for the bigger project. He felt that the council's concerns were valid.

Councilmember Flake expressed concern that a picture was worth \$8 million and if they did not have a picture then they were in trouble. Mr. McHargue said there would be a meeting in three weeks with UDOT and UTA to discuss what they wanted to see in the RFP. They would then spend three weeks creating the RFP, send it out, with three weeks to a month before they would get the bids back. He said that once the bids were back they would have another meeting to follow up with them. Mayor Fullmer stated that this was not the timeline she was given.

Mr. Overson said that he was concerned with some of the stakeholders who had attended the meeting, including UVU and UTA. He did not want to lose them again. He said that UVU's side

of the station was critical to where everything was on the City's side of the station. He felt that this was a great plan to help solidify what the city's view was.

Councilmember Riley said that given the nature of the stakeholders, someone was going to have to have a tremendous compacity to orchestrate and help the city with their vision. He hoped that staff could evaluate if the firms had the experience to help walk the city through the process, given the critical nature of the project and the stakeholders involved.

Mayor Fullmer said that the current plan with the core group was to hire someone similar to this to design a project, interview the City Council and staff to find their vision, and design a picture. She suggested that if they decided to go with a design firm, then they cancel the core group's RFP. She felt that it was important to include all of the necessary core entities in this process.

Stewart Park with Anderson Geneva stated that as the landowner on the west side, Anderson Geneva would be more likely to have something happen on their side than on the UVU side. He said the UVU was years down the road on developing their property. He mentioned that they had not been invited to that meeting. Mayor Fullmer explained what happened to create the meeting. She said that they had sent out an invitation to the Anderson Geneva to the next meeting. Mr. Park was discussing a different meeting. Mayor Fullmer explained that the other meeting was to inform the city that they had secured the funding. There was further discussion about the Town Center and train station meetings.

Mayor Fullmer called for further questions. Ms. Hart felt that it would not double their efforts but would give Vineyard their vision for what they wanted. The other group would have a vision for what the group wanted and this design would add to that vision and make it better.

Councilmember Judd stated that he did not see the expertise with Saltus. He felt that if Vineyard wanted to make it their vision, then they needed to have the expertise.

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER FLAKE MOVED TO CONTINUE THE DISCUSSION UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING. COUNCILMEMBER EARNEST SECONDED THE MOTION. MAYOR FULLMER, COUNCILMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND RILEY VOTED AYE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CLOSED SESSION

No closed session was held.

ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Fullmer called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER FLAKE MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:18 PM. COUNCILMEMBER JUDD SECONDED THE MOTION. MAYOR FULLMER, COUNCILMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND RILEY VOTED AYE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next regularly scheduled meeting is June 13, 2018.

MINUTES APPROVED ON: June 13, 2018

CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: /s/ Pamela Spencer
PAMELA SPENCER, CITY RECORDER